

Remarks

In the Official Action of August 6, 2004, the Examiner indicated that all claims (1-54) were subject to restriction under 35 U.S.C. § 121. The Examiner restricted the claimed invention into one Species I directed to Figs. 1-7, and Species II directed to Figs. 8-17. The Examiner also indicated that only 51 “appears to be generic.”

Applicant respectfully traverses this species requirement. Contrary to the Examiner’s assertions, no claims are generic to both species. Moreover, the Examiner has improperly characterized Species I as being directed to Figs. 1-7, when in fact Fig. 7 shows a view of the embodiment of Figs. 8-17 (Species II). Thus, the election of species requirement should properly be characterized as being between Figs. 1-6 and Figs. 7-17, and not between Figs. 1-7 and 8-17.


Applicant submits that all of the pending claims 1-54 are specifically directed to the elected species embodiment shown in Figs. 7-17.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the election of species requirement is improper. Nevertheless, Applicant has elected Species II directed to Figs. 7-17, which is readable on each of pending claims 1-54.

P24187.A05

The Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any necessary fees in connection therewith or any fees necessary to preserve the pendency of this application to deposit account No. 19-0089.

Respectfully submitted,
KETTLER et al.



Neil F. Greenblum
Reg. No. 28,394

RF 35,043

September 7, 2004
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191